

Gr-35

BARD
S
1
F23349
v.25:
no.19-33
1964

the organized farmer

COMPETITION - A Costly Business

If you want to get a discussion started among prairie farmers or farm organizations, just say railways, because railways are vital to our prairie society. Over much of Eastern Canada, the United States and Europe, rivers, canals, and coastal shipping provide a lot of transportation. In the very early days of the West, this same method was used, because no other means of shipment was available. River steamers came West from Manitoba up the North Saskatchewan River to Fort Edmonton and the South Saskatchewan to Medicine Hat. However, this was a very primitive arrangement, and the vast prairie grainlands would never have developed as long as we had to depend on these two river systems for transportation.

But the new system of transportation known as railways was recognized in the 1870's and 1880's as a means of opening up land which was far removed from water transportation. In the 1890's and early 1900's railways were built all across the prairies and parklands of Western Canada, and within a quarter of a century, the wilderness turned into settled, well established communities.

The opening of the West was made possible because of railways, but likewise, the huge transportation system known as the CPR and CNR were made possible because of the assistance they received from the people of Canada, through governments, and because they had a monopoly on the transportation into and out of this vast wealthy mid-continent area. This monopoly has enabled the CPR over the last 75 years to grow from a very shaky beginning in the late 1800's to perhaps the largest corporation in Canada, worth about one and one-quarter billion dollars, according to the Financial Post — worth about as much as Imperial Oil and Shell Oil of Canada combined.

All of this must be borne in mind when we tackle the problem which now faces Canada, the problem of overhauling our transportation system, so that it will serve the "truck and automobile" society of today, instead of the horse and wagon society which it was built to serve.

Just recently the Federal Government introduced Bill C 120, which is an Act to amend the Railway Act. This bill is modelled to a very large extent upon the recommendations of the McPherson Commission. This brings us to the problem that is worrying prairie farmers. The commission recommended that some of the railway branch lines — those that were not paying their way should be abandoned. The railways have taken up this idea with a good deal of enthusiasm. They want to abandon 476 miles in Alberta, mostly in the dry country North and East of Hanna, with some between Camrose and Vegreville.

In Saskatchewan they want to abandon almost 2,000 miles scattered all over the province, and in Manitoba they want to abandon another 1,000 miles, for a total of almost 3,500 miles, for a total of it is presently introduced says that if a line is not paying, the railway may present figures to the Board

FAR NORTHERN GRAIN ELEVATOR

The Alberta Wheat Pool will soon commence construction of an 80,000 bushel elevator and an agent's dwelling at High Level on the Pine Point railway. The point is located 183 miles north of Grimshaw and is only 117 miles south of Alberta's northern border. The elevator will serve a wide area in the north that is being rapidly settled and brought under the plow. High Level will be Canada's farthest north grain receiving point.

Construction of the elevator will begin immediately and it should be in operation before Christmas.

of Railway Commissioners showing that the line is losing money. If the Board agrees, then that line must be abandoned within five years. Another organization known as the Branch Lines Rationalization Authority, will set the exact date for abandonment, after considering the effects on the communities and the people involved. Farm organizations are not at

all happy about this. As the Alberta Federation of Agriculture pointed out in a recent press release, the railways do not have to establish whether or not they were operating the line efficiently. All they have to prove is that they are losing money. The Wheat Pools are also disturbed by this provision of the bill. It has been suggested in some quarters that all Pools will naturally object to lines being abandoned because they have heavy elevator investments on these lines. The Alberta Pool, however points out that they have never opposed justifiable abandonment. They have insisted however, that such abandonment must be justified, and it must be carefully tied into an overall plan, which can be carried out gradually, so that the area being abandoned can get readjusted to the change and can get highways and other transportation requirements established.

It is time that farm organizations got together and prepared a uniform plan of what is needed in order to protect the farming industry, across the prairies, in the light of this possible abandonment of over 3,000 miles of rail lines, and I think that they need to keep at least three points in mind.

First of all, abandoning a line may mean abandoning a community which acts as a service centre for the surrounding farm area. How well can this area survive if the service centre — the local town — is left without a rail line? If the farmer must go elsewhere to deliver his grain, he will do his other business elsewhere too. Grain deliveries are the heart of most of our small prairie towns.

What services are located in the town which is to be deserted — school, hospital, municipal offices, etc? If so, where will the people go to obtain such services in the

future? If they are available at other points, what about the roads to those points? And are the services there able to cope with the increased demand? The farmers may be faced with a lot more driving if they must go to two different points for goods and services they need.

The second point is this. No rail line should be abandoned unless and until the company can show that it has done everything possible to cut losses on that line. It is not good enough to prove that the line is losing money. Any line will lose money if it is operated, with enough inefficiency. In the past, stations were kept open, passenger service was operated, and other services were offered at a loss, in some cases for years, before they were finally cancelled. We can all remember when the local passenger train ran up and
(Continued on Page 4)

GENERAL SCIENCES

Canvasser's Round Up



HURRY! HURRY! HURRY!

ONLY A WEEK LEFT TO GET YOUR SALES OF

LIFE MEMBERSHIPS

in to Head Office to qualify for a chance to win a

Ticket On The Tour

Your remittance must be in the head office at 9934 - 106 Street, Edmonton by October 30, 1964.

You must sell at least five memberships. (Use the bargain rate of \$94.00 each for members in good standing in 1964, up to October 30.)

The person selling the greatest number gets to go on the 1965 membership tour of the Pacific North West.

No F.U.A., Jr. F.U.A., F.W.U.A. provincial board member is eligible to win this contest.

The BACKGROUND HISTORY PROBLEMS CHANGES SUGGESTIONS

by BILL HARPER

FOR YOUR IN

For the past 10 years or so, there has been a gradually mounting pressure in Alberta, for an amalgamation of farm forces—for the bringing together of all farm organizations which work for and speak for the farmers. In January 1962, the A.F.A. set up a committee composed of Senator Donald Cameron, Mr. Len Nesbitt, former publicity director for the Alberta Wheat Pool, and Mr. Arnold Platt, past president of the F.U.A., to inquire into this problem, and to bring back a report and recommendations which it was expected would provide a working basis for a new organization for Alberta farmers. This report was presented and considered by the F.U.A. and the A.F.A. conventions last winter. Since that time a good

A New Farm Organization

Alberta farmers face many problems. There is the problem of markets, the problem of prices, the problem of trading arrangements with other countries who need our wheat and perhaps can't pay for it in cash. Getting closer to home, there is the problem of change in our farm communities, the problem of working with other Canadian groups, such as labor unions, Chamber of Commerce, etc., and finally there is the problem of farmers working with each other. This is perhaps the basic problem and until we solve it we will have a hard time solving the others.

Farm organizations in Alberta have a history going back 60 years. When the province first settled about 1900, a number of homesteaders came from the midwestern U.S. There were farm organizations there at that time — the Society of Equity being one of them, and some of its members, when they settled in Alberta, set up branches of that organization here. About the same time the Grain Growers Association came into being, and Alberta farmers, even in those early days, had two organizations to represent them.

In 1909 these two organizations got together, after several years of squabbling, to form the United Farmers of Alberta. This organization was the only farm body in the province for about 30 years — until the end of the 1930's. Then another group was set up, mostly in Northern Alberta known as the Alberta Farmers Union. Again for several years until 1949 Alberta farmers were represented by two organizations. Again after a short period of confusion, good sense took over and the two groups amalgamated into the the present Farmers' Union of Alberta.

However, in the meantime something else was happening. The farm organizations over the years, had encouraged, and helped their members to build up powerful co-operative marketing agencies. The U.G.G., the Wheat Pool, the U.F.A. Co-op., the Dairy and Poultry Co-ops, the A.L.C. and others, large and small, became an essential part of the farm picture in Alberta. They are the commercial arm of the organized farm movement.

I suppose it is what is called a historical accident that during the late 1930's and early 1940's when these co-ops were really getting established, and were proving that they could be of very great help to their members, the parent organization, the old U.F.A. was at its lowest ebb. The U.F.A. went into politics in 1921 and formed the gov't of Alberta until 1935 when it was defeated at the polls. Membership, and prestige fell off very badly for the next few years. The co-ops, in their growing power, began to need a strong, well-financed organization to represent them, in meeting with Gov't at the Provincial and Federal level, and in doing some overall planning for their own future. The question was — what organization should do it. The U.F.A., at that time, for the reasons outlined, did not seem to be a very sure bet.

And so another organization was developed, to speak for Alberta's farmers. This one, the A.F.A., has no direct membership. It is made up of organizations and at its meetings the delegates speak in the name of the Pool, or the U.F.A. Co-op, or the F.U.A., or the U.G.G. or whatever organization they represent — not for the individual farmer or farm local.

It appears, therefore, that the ordinary farmer is speaking to the Gov't. with two voices, the voice of the F.U.A. and the voice of the A.F.A., and when, as has happened, these two voices do not agree, the Gov't is understandably confused.

Serious consideration is now being given to getting these two groups together and anyone who knows anything about the history of Western farmers knows that this is bound to happen, sooner or later. However, it will help to get this job done if we farmers do a little straight thinking about the whole problem, and if we recognize all the facts of the case.

First of all, we must not blame anybody for the fact that we have two organizations, because they both came into existence in a perfectly normal way, and they have both served a useful purpose, and have done a lot of good work for the farmer. Let's not waste time looking back, except to see what we can learn from the past. Let's plan ahead.

Secondly, we must realize that our farm communities have changed more, in the last 20 years, than any of us like to admit. Look around your own district. How many one-roomed schools have closed up since 1940? Every one of these schools was a community centre. F.U.A., or U.F.A. locals met in many of them. Now they are gone, and in many cases the F.U.A. locals are gone too. What about country stores? You can think of a lot of them that are closed up also. Why?

Because good roads and good cars mean that the town 20 miles away can be reached in half an hour — as fast as the old horse and buggy could cover one or two miles.

As a part of this change, a very large percentage of our farm people have left the land. 15 years ago there were over 84,000 farmers in Alberta. Now there are about 58,000 — a drop of nearly 2,000 per year, or 30% in 15 years.

Along with this, farming itself has changed. In many parts of the province, you may find a farm, perhaps of several thousand acres, with not a single head of livestock or poultry. On another farm you will find several hundred pigs, and not much else, or several thousand laying hens, or fifty dairy cows, or some other special line. The whole farm is set up to support the special line of production. This tendency toward specialization is increasing, and will continue to increase.

Our Department of Agriculture used to spend a lot of time encouraging Alberta farmers to go into mixed farming. It was a good idea 30 or 40 years ago, but they never mention it any more. Instead they encourage specialization in one or two lines—not because the old idea was wrong. It was right, 30 years ago, but it is wrong today. For example, a farmer can't let a \$6,000 diesel tractor or a \$10,000 combine sit idle while he fusses around feeding a half dozen ducks, or 25 hens. Our farming world has changed.

In such a world, our farm organizations must also change. The question is—how? In answering this question, we must not be afraid of new ideas. Let's look at every possibility. For example, the idea of a local group meeting together in the little country schoolhouse fitted perfectly into a farm community of 30 years ago, where they had a little country schoolhouse. Does the idea of locals fit into our present rural communities, or is there some other way of organizing? Could we build up a stronger organization by having sub-district meetings every three months, instead of locals every month, and with delegates from the sub-districts attending the annual convention or maybe two conventions, per year, and reporting back to a big, general sub-district meeting?

Or maybe we should keep our locals, and change their type of program. Suppose the monthly meeting of the F.U.A. local was the place for our co-ops to report—the Wheat Pool in January, the U.G.G. in February, the U.F.A. Co-op in March, the C.C.I.L. in April, the Dairy Pools in May, the Poultry Pool in June, and so on. Following the report, the subject of grains or machinery, or egg marketing, could be discussed, with the Co-op authorities who were present.

At one time farmers were officers and members of farm organizations but very seldom did they take office in any town or city groups. Within the last 30 years or so, all this has been changed. It is by no means uncommon to find a farmer as president of a board of trade, or any other town organization. Even in the chambers of commerce in our larger cities, farmers are well represented.

In a business sense, too, farmers are much closer to their city neighbor. The agricultural industry does not stop at the farm, the packing plant or the flour mill. Farmers are big users of chemical products—insect sprays, veterinary medicines, weed sprays, to name only a few — which were unknown a generation ago. We are also large users of fuel and lubricating oil — a business which hardly existed 40 years ago. We are vitally concerned with the agricultural scientist and his work on new kinds of crop, new varieties, new feeding methods, new machines and so on. We are concerned with our government's attitude on electric power, which was of no interest to the farmers even 20 years ago. We are tied up, in dozens of ways with other groups in our society. We must deal with them. We need their products just as badly as they need ours. There are hundreds of farms in Alberta that never produce a quart of milk or an egg, or in many cases, a vegetable. Our farms are becoming specialized.

If we must deal with other groups we must be in as strong a position to deal as they are. The whole idea of having a market, in which there is both a buyer and a seller, is that neither one should have control—that each is dependent on the other, so that they can deal on equal footing. This is the position that farmers have always lacked and in this day of big business, big government, and big labor, we lack it more than ever, and it is hurting us more than ever. Farmers are in trouble because all these other people with whom the farmer deals, are organized. How many businessmen in your town do not belong to the local chamber of commerce or board of trade. Very few. What about the farm machinery you buy, or the oil that comes through the refinery, or the railway or trucking company that hauls your produce. How many of their workers do not belong to a union.

What about nurses. If they don't get more than \$6.

And unions have those wages factor in by 35% down by sure is Farmers' other groups.

Let's society, v It will p

Our vari of an ed its own

There w one was and edu change, keep the happeni have sor tion has

And tached to result is competit up this c attached that par gram for eectivel

And pendent

The the pare can neve out in th farm pul When a question me, or a such a q up on w ting the to do it.

100% co organiza I think it

I re reporting for over Union C up by th This co-d area and Notice th 47,000 re made on

In a Kenfield an impor trolled co education

Perk velopmen to carry question doing it up the F most of c and prom adequate only ones track. Bu long esta have to

FORMATION

l of discussion concerning this proposed new organization taken place among Alberta farmers, both privately and at m meetings.

At the various farm conventions which will be held during the next 3 or 4 months, this matter will no doubt receive their careful consideration.

It is time for the next step — for some more decisive action. This will be one of the most important decisions in the history of Alberta farm organization. For this reason, the Organized Farmer presents in this issue some of the background and pertinent information which has appeared from time to time, in connection with this new farm proposal for Alberta.

out your doctors, your lawyers, your school teachers, your Every last one of them belongs to a union. They can't work on't. And they pay fees in their union. Big fees. Much more 00 per year.

what has been the result of them paying big fees? Their have gotten higher and higher wages for their members. And ges, taken all the way back along the line are an important increasing the prices of the things you buy, Mr. Farmer, since 1949. And the price of your produce — it has gone 18.6% since 1949. Why? Part of the reason you can be because only half of the farmers of Alberta belong to the Union, in comparison to the 100% membership of many ups.

s quit kidding ourselves. If we want to keep our place in this we'd better get together, like everyone else. It has paid them. ay us.

farm organizations in Alberta got off the track years ago. ous farm co-ops, most of which were established as a result ucational program through the old U.F.A. each went along lines, and cut loose entirely from the parent organization. ere two results from this—both of them harmful. The first that each of these co-ops soon set up their own publicity cational program. This was necessary. In this age of fast and world-wide contacts it is essential that all organizations ir members informed of what they are doing and what is ng. This is particularly true of a co-op, where the members ne responsibility for management, and where the organiza- only one purpose—to serve its members.

so we have a number of field service departments, each at- a Co-op, and each working among the farmer members. The a certain amount of duplication and occasionally downright ion between our various farm co-ops. Under the present set- cannot be avoided but if each of these co-ops had remained to the parent organization, the U.F.A.—now the F.U.A.— ent organization could have carried out the educational pro- them all, undoubtedly at less expense, and undoubtedly more y, because duplication and competition could be avoided.

so, the first harmful result of each co-op going its own inde- way is waste and inefficiency in the field of farm organization. second harmful result is a result of this first one. It is that nt organization is always starved financially and therefore r do the job that needs to be done, either among members e country, or in adequately telling the farm story to the non- lic. Both of these needs are very great and very important. membership drive is in operation for the F.U.A. a common asked by many farmers is "What did the F.U.A. ever do for y other farmer?" There is not much use in getting angry at uestion. Maybe the man is poorly informed and not keeping at is happening, but that simply means that we are not get- F.U.A. story to him. Why? Because we haven't the money

And I am quite sure that our farm co-ops are not getting ntact either. Could it not be done more efficiently if the parent ion, the F.U.A. was organizing the whole job for all co-ops? could.

cently read an article in the Montana Farmers Union News, that the Montana Farmers Union had just received a cheque \$47,000 for their education fund. This was sent by the Farmers entral Exchange, a farm supply co-operative which was set e co-ops in Northern States to act as their wholesale supplier. p wholesale is tied firmly to the state farmers unions in the the unions act as the education and publicity department. at the name is "The Farmers Union Central Exchange". The presented 5% of the net savings which the Central Exchange the business done with Montana farm co-ops last year. cknowledging the receipt of this cheque, President Leonard of the Montana Farmers Union said "We are proud to have tant part in promoting and supporting farmer-owned and con- o-operatives. Montana Farmers Union carries on an extensive al program on behalf of co-operatives."

aps we in Alberta need to look at Montana's pattern of de- nt. Undoubtedly our co-ops and our farm organization need on a continuing program of education and information. The is—who should do it. I do not see the point of each co-op on their own. We have, I think, made a good start by setting U. & C.D.A., which is financed jointly by the F.U.A. and our larger co-ops. If we can get this whole field of education otion of co-ops and farm organizations under single direction, ly financed by the commercial organizations who are the s able to finance it, then, in my opinion we will back on the t this will mean a genuine "getting together" in which some blished departments of some of our farm organizations may be willingly sacrificed for the general good.

**N
O
V
E
M
B
E
R

9

I
S

S
I
G
N
-
U
P

D
A
Y**

In the Meantime Keep In Mind NOVEMBER 9th. is SIGN-UP DAY

from the AFA Committee Report

The Farmers Union is the organization that should provide the greatest opportunity for member participation. Theoretically, it does so but in practice their country organization leaves much to be desired. The basis is the local, which can be small or large, blessed with good leadership or none at all; free to contribute both locally and provincially or do nothing; and left to its own devices to obtain financial resources, leadership training and programming assistance.

Under these conditions we found excellent locals, poor locals, good locals and great areas where, in fact, no locals existed at all. It seems impossible for the central office to keep in touch or to give assistance, even if the resources for assistance were available. We conclude that while locals are useful devices, they are too small to be used as the basis of farm organization.

The provincial and large regional owned co-operatives also face problems. For the most part they do a reasonably good job of reporting back to their members through their delegates and field staff. But their members have little opportunity to express their opinions and to advance their ideas to the annual meetings. This is because the co-operatives lack local organization. They are reluctant to encourage such because if they were successful, this would lessen the effectiveness of the Farmers' Union and almost certainly lead to conflict.

We are strongly of the opinion that lack of individual member participation is the greatest problem facing farm organization in Alberta. If improvements are to be made many things must be done. The member must be supplied with information on which he can make reasonable decisions. To obtain the required information, research must frequently be conducted. Local leadership must have an opportunity to receive training and guidance so that they in fact can give leadership in meeting both local and national problems. Adequate money must be available to finance local or organization.

We are recommending that the basic unit of local organization be the county with the county board composed of farmers elected representatives of each of the member organizations of the Federation and that at the provincial level the present functions of the Federation and the Farmers' Union be incorporated into one unit, a new Farmers' Union.

The Farm Union Locals would remain largely in their present form. They would, however, be the complete responsibility of the new county organization.

We would recommend that what we have chosen to call County Organizations be the basic structure of the whole organization. The functions of the county organization may be summarized as follows:

1. To take action on all local matters pertaining to the welfare of farm people in the county.
2. To be responsible for organization including the collection of membership fees.
3. To promote self help projects especially co-operative action.
4. To be responsible for member education.
5. To give assistance to the special problems of commodity groups.
6. To prepare, discuss and forward to the provincial annual meeting resolutions pertaining to the welfare of farmers on a provincial, national or international level.

The provincial board of the new Farmers' Union would consist of a president and vice-president elected at the annual convention of the Association plus the 14 members elected from the present 14 Farmers' Union districts plus 8 members from the present Federation Board.

This board would have the usual functions of a provincial board amongst which would be the responsibility for carrying out policies decided upon at the annual convention; providing information on which policy decisions can be made by the membership; maintaining liaison with the county organizations; and in general managing the affairs of the organization.

At the annual meeting, of the new Farmers Union delegate status would be given to:

1. All members of the provincial board.
2. All chairmen of county organizations.
3. Four delegates elected from the annual meeting of each county organization.
4. Representatives of provincial co-ops and commodity groups.

The approximate numbers involved would be as follows:

From the provincial board	25
County chairmen	55
Elected delegates from county organizations	220
Representatives of provincial co-operatives and commodity groups	100
TOTAL	400

Resolutions to come before the annual convention would originate only from:

1. The annual meetings of county organizations.
2. The annual meetings of member co-operatives and commodity groups.
3. The provincial board of directors.

FARMERS' UNION OF ALBERTA

9934 - 106 St., Edmonton, Alta.
Phone 424-0375
After 5:00 p.m. 489-6955

the organized farmer

EDITOR — PAUL BABEY
Assistant Editor — Ken Nelson

Subscriptions — \$1.00 a year
Authorized Second Class Mail,
Post Office Department, Ottawa,
and for payment of postage in cash
FARMERS' UNION OF ALBERTA
9934 - 106 St., F.U.A. Bldg.,
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

Printed by Co-op Press Ltd., Edmonton, Alta.

FWUA Hi-Lights

CHESTERMERE FUWA (Calgary) — Miss Dianne Craig sponsored by Federated Co-ops, Saskatoon, will be guest speaker at the October meeting. Topic will be "Credit Uses and Abuses."

SUNNYNOOK FWUA 1116 — has sent \$5 to the Hanna and District Association for Retarded Children.

MILO-QUEENSTOWN FWUA — has celebrated the birthday of two members who have contributed much to the community and the organization over the years, Mrs. Myrtle Monner of Milo and Mrs. Laura Sutherland of Majorville.

Mrs. Monner attended the FWUA Annual Convention in 1917. She was local secretary for many years.

Mrs. Sutherland served as treasurer of the local for the last nine years, and has always attended the annual conferences and conventions.

Both ladies were honored last year at the FWUA Golden Anniversary Convention last December in Calgary.

EGREMONT FWUA — reports the passing of a dedicated member Mrs. M. Pruss. Mrs. Pruss served as treasurer for this local from its beginning in 1958. Besides her husband, she leaves one son, a daughter, one grandson, and a sister in Poland. Mrs. Pruss came to Canada in 1933.

WEST WIND FWUA 1217 — Prize money amounting to \$20 was received for having the best organized float, in the Pincher Creek Fair. A donation of \$5 will be sent to the Canadian Mental Health Association.

KSITUAN FWUA 109 — A bursary of \$5 was sent to the central office of the FWUA for the Irene Parlbry Scholarship Fund.

HEATH FWUA 703 — At the

District Dinner to be held at the Elks Hall in Wainwright, each member is to bring a gift for the Mental Health Shopping Fair. A donation of \$1.80 was made to the A.C.W.W.

COMPETITION . . .

(Continued from Page 1)

down the line daily, with three or four passengers in two or more coaches, and 100 empty seats, while the bus on the road beside the track carried 20 or 30 passengers, and was often full up. We wonder whether the railways have gotten rid of all the inefficiency of those days. Certainly, before they are allowed to abandon any line, they must prove that no further economies are possible.

Thirdly, if a lot of lines are to be abandoned, it may well be that a few short connecting lines must be built to make better connections. For example, there are 13 rail lines coming into Edmonton. In two cases a pair of lines come within a mile or less of each other, about 30 miles out of the city. From there in they run almost parallel. There is no reason whatever why these lines should not join, and so 60 miles of line could be taken out. But no — it won't work because these lines belong to rival companies. The same applies to Calgary, where seven lines come in and two of them run very close together for at least 50 miles. One of them should be taken out, but here again, they belong to two companies and neither wants to give up their line.

This brings up what appears to me to be the greatest weakness in the McPherson Report, and in Bill C-120. There is no suggestion made that our rail lines could get rid of a lot of costly and unnecessary duplication if they were amalgamated. I cannot see how anyone can justify shipping wheat from Drumheller to Vancouver, for example, by way of Edmonton, just because the elevator where this wheat was delivered happens to be on CN lines. The CP and CN both run through Drumheller. The CP goes direct to Vancouver — a distance of 744 miles. The CN must go to Edmonton in order to get to Vancouver — a distance of 965 miles or 221 miles further, but the rates are the same, in order

to be competitive. Now if the CN makes any money on this haul, then the CP must make a fortune. But if the CN is losing on this haul why should the people of Canada pay them a subsidy? They should be made to hire the CP to

haul freight by the shorter route.

Of course this will never happen while we have two lines. Why do we have them then? There are no competitive rates. Rates are set by the Board of Railway Commissioners. Furthermore, there is no com-

petition as far as farmers are concerned. The farmer must ship his grain on the railway which goes through his shipping point. In very few cases can he use the other line.

Just why do we have two rail systems in Canada?



An amazing deduction!

Consider the cost of farm operation today . . . consider the insignificance of individual purchasing power. The logical conclusion to these thoughts must approach the idea of "co-operative."

Consider the basic purpose of one great co-operative — UNITED FARMERS OF ALBERTA: to combine the purchasing power of its 50,000 shareholders; thus reducing the cost of farm supplies and petroleum products and ultimately lowering the cost of farm operations.

It follows that: Membership in U.F.A. Co-op is not only desirable, it is **necessary**.

Consider that eight farm supply outlets and numerous Maple Leaf petroleum bulk agencies put the services of U.F.A. Co-op within easy reach of every Alberta farmer.

DEDUCTION: Membership in UNITED FARMERS OF ALBERTA CO-OPERATIVE is a SURE step toward more profitable farming.



UNITED FARMERS OF ALBERTA CO-OP

"Owned by farmers—controlled by farmers—
and operated SOLELY for the benefit of farmers."

OPEN FORUM

Box 124,
Carstairs, Alberta,
July 31, 1964

Farmers' Union of Alberta,
9934 - 106th Street,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Dear Sir:

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Jr. F.U.A. for sending me to the Saskatchewan Farm Young People's Week, July 13-18. The week consisted of lectures, films, recreation and tours.

Some of the lectures were: Continuing education—we were told about jobs that were deadend jobs and the ones which have a bright future. Another one was about farm management, father and son agreements and life insurance. One day was taken up by a lecture on public speaking, roll playing, and how to conduct meetings. This proved to be very successful.

We were also taught the new method of drown proofing and different methods of swimming. A film and demonstration were given on power safety which proved to be very interesting.

We toured the Fort Qu'Appelle Sanatorium, the fisheries, and the pottery making shop.

Swimming, dancing, and games were part of the activities throughout the week.

You may take this report and put it in the paper if you like to. If you would like more information about the week please write and I shall try to give it to you.

Yours sincerely, Marilyn Eby

Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration has fenced 2½ million acres of submarginal land for community pastures since 1937.

**DO
YOU
KNOW...**

M.S.I. was the first plan in Canada to offer a comprehensive non-group coverage to all residents regardless of age or physical condition.

